arXiv:1409.2709v1 [stat.ME] 9 Sep 2014

CONVERGENCE OF HYBRID SLICE SAMPLING VIA SPECTRAL GAP

KRZYSZTOF ŁATUSZYŃSKI AND DANIEL RUDOLF

Abstract. It is known that the simple slice sampler has very robust convergence properties, however the class of problems where it can be implemented is limited. In contrast, we consider hybrid slice samplers which are easily implementable and where another Markov chain approximately samples the uniform distribution on each slice. Under appropriate assumptions on the Markov chain on the slice we show a lower bound and an upper bound of the spectral gap of the hybrid slice sampler in terms of the spectral gap of the simple slice sampler. An immediate consequence of this is that spectral gap and geometric ergodicity of the hybrid slice sampler can be concluded from spectral gap and geometric ergodicity of its simple version which is very well understood. These results indicate that robustness properties of the simple slice sampler are inherited by (appropriately designed) easily implementable hybrid versions and provide the first theoretical underpinning of their use in applications. We apply the developed theory and analyse a number of specific algorithms such as the stepping-out shrinkage slice sampling, hit-and-run slice sampling on very general multidimensional targets and an easily implementable combination of both procedures on fairly general and realistic multidimensional bimodal densities.

1. Introduction

Slice sampling algorithms are designed for Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling from a distribution given by a possibly unnormalised density. They belong to the class of auxiliary variable algorithms that define a suitable Markov chain on an extended state space. Following [WS87] and [ES88] a number of different versions have been discussed and proposed in [BG93, Nea93, Hig98, RR99, MMR01, MT02, RR02, MAM10]. We refer to these papers for details of algorithmic design and applications in Bayesian inference and statistical physics. Here let us first focus on the appealing *simple slice sampler* setting in which no further algorithmic tuning or design by the user is necessary: assume that $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and let the unnormalised density be

D.R. was supported by the DFG-Priority Program 1324 and the DFG Research Training Group 1523.

$\varrho\colon K \to [0,\infty)$. The goal is to sample with respect to the distribution π determined by ϱ, i.e.

$$\pi(A) = \frac{\int_A \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{\int_K \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}, \qquad A \in \mathcal{B}(K),$$

were $\mathcal{B}(K)$ denotes the Borel σ-algebra. Given the current state $X_n = x \in K$, the *simple slice sampling* algorithm generates the next Markov chain instance X_{n+1} by the following two steps:

(1) choose t uniformly at random from $[0, \varrho(x)]$, i.e. $t \sim \mathcal{U}[0, \varrho(x)]$;
(2) choose X_{t+1} uniformly at random from

$$K(t) := \{x \in K \mid \varrho(x) \geq t\},$$

the level set of ϱ determined by t.

The above defined *simple slice sampler* possesses very robust convergence properties that have been observed empirically and established formally. In particular Mira and Tierney [MT02] proved that: If ϱ is bounded and the support of ϱ has finite Lebesgue measure, then the simple slice sampler is *uniformly ergodic*. Roberts and Rosenthal provide in [RR99] criterions for *geometric ergodicity*. The imposed conditions are rather weak. For bounded ϱ it is sufficient that the Lebesgue measure of the level sets is differentiable and satisfies a non-increasing property on an open set containing 0. For unbounded ϱ with infinite support it is sufficient that the Lebesgue measure and the inverse of the Lebesgue measure of the level sets satisfy a non-increasing property. Furthermore in [RR99, RR02] the authors prove explicit estimates of the total variation distance.

Unfortunately, the applicability of the simple slice sampler is limited. In high dimensions sampling uniformly from the level set of ϱ is in general infeasible and thus the second step of the algorithm above can not be performed. Consequently, the second step is replaced by sampling a Markov chain with invariant distribution uniform on the level set. Following the terminology of [RR97] we call such algorithms *hybrid slice samplers*. We refer to [Nea03] where various procedures and designs for the Markov chain on the slice are suggested and insightful expert advice is given. Further discussion and examples are provided in our accompanying paper [ŁRT14].

Being easy to implement, the *hybrid slice sampler* has not been analysed theoretically and little is known about its properties. The present paper is aimed at closing this gap and provide rigorous theoretical underpinning of its reliable use in applications.

To this end we study the $L_{2,\pi}$ spectral gap of hybrid slice samplers. The $L_{2,\pi}$ spectral gap of a Markov operator P or a corresponding Markov chain $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is given by

$$\operatorname{gap}(P) = 1 - \|P\|_{L^0_{2,\pi}\to L^0_{2,\pi}},$$

where $L^0_{2,\pi}$ is the space of functions $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}$ with zero mean and finite variance (i.e. $\int_K f(x)\mathrm{d}\pi(x) = 0$; $\|f\|_2^2 = \int_K |f(x)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\pi(x) < \infty$) and $\|P\|_{L^0_{2,\pi}\to L^0_{2,\pi}}$ denotes the operator norm. We refer to [Rud91] for the functional analytic background. From the computational point of view, existence of the spectral gap (i.e. $\operatorname{gap}(P) > 0$) implies a number of desirable and well studied robustness properties. In particular

- the spectral gap implies geometric ergodicity [RR97, KM12] and the variance bounding property [RR08];
- for reversible Markov chains the spectral gap implies that a CLT holds for all functions $f \in L_{2,\pi}$ [KS86, Gey92];
- furthermore, consistent estimation of the CLT asymptotic variance is well established for geometrically ergodic chains (c.f. [HJPR02, JHCN06, BŁ07, FJ10]).

Additionally, quantitative information on the spectral gap allows the formulation of precise non-asymptotic statements. In particular, it is well known [NR14, Lemma 2] that if ν is the initial distribution of the reversible Markov chain in question, i.e. $\nu = \mathbb{P}_{X_1}$, then

$$\|\nu P^n - \pi\|_{\mathrm{tv}} \leq (1 - \operatorname{gap}(P))^n \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_2,$$

where $\nu P^n = \mathbb{P}_{X_{n+1}}$. See [Bax05, Section 6] for a related L_2 convergence result. More usefully, when considering the sample average, one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}\left| \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} f(X_j) - \int_K f(x)\mathrm{d}\pi(x) \right|^2 \leq \frac{2}{n\cdot\operatorname{gap}(P)} + \frac{c_p \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_\infty}{n^2\cdot\operatorname{gap}(P)},$$

for any $p > 2$ and any function $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\|f\|_p^p = \int_K |f(x)|^p \,\pi(\mathrm{d}x) \leq 1$, where c_p is an explicit constant which depends only on p. One can also take a burn-in into account, for further details see [Rud12, Theorem 3.41]. This indicates that the spectral gap of a Markov chain is central to robustness and a crucial quantity in both asymptotic and non-asymptotic analysis of MCMC estimators.

The route we endeavour is to conclude the spectral gap of the hybrid slice sampler from the more tractable spectral gap of the simple slice sampler. So what is known about the spectral gap of the simple slice

sampler? The uniform ergodicity result of [MT02] implies a quantitative bound, namely

$$\operatorname{gap}(U) \geq \frac{\int_K \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{\|\varrho\|_\infty \operatorname{vol}_d(K)}, \tag{1}$$

where U denotes the Markov operator of the simple slice sampler and vol_d denotes the Lebesgue measure. Note that, essentially K must be bounded for (1) to be meaningful. Since the simple slice sampler is reversible and irreducible, geometric ergodicity is equivalent to $\operatorname{gap}(U) > 0$, see [RR97]. Thus the criterions for geometric ergodicity of [RR99] imply $\operatorname{gap}(U) > 0$ and translate to qualitative results about existence of the spectral gap.

Now we are in a position to explain our main result. Let H be the Markov kernel of the hybrid slice sampler determined by a family of transition kernels H_t, where each H_t is a Markov kernel with uniform limit distribution, say U_t, on the level determined by t. Consider

$$\beta_k := \sup_{x\in K} \left(\int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\| H_t^k - U_t \right\|^2_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}} \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)} \right)^{1/2},$$

and note that the quantity $\left\| H_t^k - U_t \right\|^2_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}$ measures how fast H_t gets close to U_t. Thus β_k is the supremum over expectations of a function which measures the speed of convergence of H_t^k to U_t. The main result is stated in Theorem 8 and it is as follows: Assume that $\beta_k \to 0$ for increasing k and assume H_t induces a positive semi-definite Markov operator for every level t. Then

$$\frac{\operatorname{gap}(U) - \beta_k}{k} \leq \operatorname{gap}(H) \leq \operatorname{gap}(U), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2}$$

The first inequality implies that whenever there exists a spectral gap of the simple slice sampler and $\beta_k \to 0$, then there is a spectral of the hybrid slice sampler. The second inequality of (2) verifies a very intuitive result, namely that the simple slice sampler is always better than the hybrid one.

We demonstrate how to apply our main theorem in different settings. First, we consider a stepping-out shrinkage slice sampler, suggested in [Nea03], in a simple bimodal 1-dimensional setting. Next we turn to the d-dimensional case and on each slice perform a single step of the hit-and-run algorithm, studied in [Smi84, BRS93, Lov99]. Using our main theorem, under very weak assumptions, we prove equivalence of the spectral gap (and hence geometric ergodicity) of this hybrid hit-and-run on the slice and the simple slice sampler. Finally, we combine the stepping-out shrinkage and hit-and-run slice sampler. The resulting algorithm is practical and easily implementable in multidimensional settings. For this version we again show equivalence of the spectral

gap and geometric ergodicity with the simple slice sampler for fairly general multidimensional bimodal targets.

Further note that we consider single auxiliary variable methods to keep the arguments simple. We believe that a similar analysis can also be done if one considers multi auxiliary variable methods.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 the notation and preliminary results are provided. These include a necessary and sufficient condition for reversibility of the hybrid slice sampler in Lemma 1 followed by a useful representation of the slice samplers in Subsection 2.1 which is crucial in the proof of the main result. In Section 3 we state and prove the main result. We believe that some of the lemmas and auxiliary results there are of interest on its own. For example in Corollary 6 a lower of the spectral gap of a hybrid slice sampler is provided which performs several steps with respect to H_t on the chosen level. In Section 4 we apply our result to analyse a number of specific hybrid slice sampling algorithms in different settings that include multidimensional bimodal distributions.

2. Notation and basics

Recall that $\varrho : K \to [0, \infty)$ is an unnormalised density on $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and denote the level set of ϱ as

$$K(t) = \{x \in K \mid \varrho(x) \geq t\}.$$

Hence the sequence $(K(t))_{t\geq 0}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies

(1) $K(0) = K$;
(2) $K(s) \subseteq K(t)$ for $t < s$;
(3) $K(t) = \emptyset$ for $t > \|\varrho\|_\infty$.

Let vol_d be the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure and let $(U_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a sequence of distributions, where U_t is the uniform distribution on $K(t)$, i.e.

$$U_t(A) = \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(A \cap K(t))}{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(K).$$

Further let $(H_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a sequence of transition kernels, where H_t is a transition kernel on $K(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For convenience we extend the definition of the transition kernel $H_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ on the measurable space $(K, \mathcal{B}(K))$. We set

$$\bar{H}_t(x, A) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \notin K(t), \\ H_t(x, A \cap K(t)) & x \in K(t). \end{cases}$$

In the following we write H_t for $\bar{H}_t$ and consider H_t as extension on $(K, \mathcal{B}(K))$. The transition kernel of the hybrid slice sampler is given by

$$H(x, A) = \frac{1}{\varrho(x)} \int_0^{\varrho(x)} H_t(x, A)\, \mathrm{d}t, \quad x \in K,\ A \in \mathcal{B}(K).$$

If $H_t = U_t$ we have the simple slice sampler studied in [RR99, RR02, MT02]. The transition kernel of this important special case is given by

$$U(x, A) = \frac{1}{\varrho(x)} \int_0^{\varrho(x)} U_t(A)\, \mathrm{d}t, \quad x \in K,\ A \in \mathcal{B}(K).$$

We provide a criterion for reversibility of H with respect to π. Therefore let us define the density

$$\ell(s) = \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))}{\int_0^\infty \mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))\, \mathrm{d}s}, \quad s \in [0, \infty).$$

of the distribution of the level sets on $([0, \infty), \mathcal{B}([0, \infty))$.

Lemma 1. *The transition kernel H is reversible with respect to π iff for all $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(K)$*

$$\int_0^\infty \int_B H_t(x, A)\, U_t(\mathrm{d}x)\, \ell(t)\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^\infty \int_A H_t(x, B)\, U_t(\mathrm{d}x)\, \ell(t)\mathrm{d}t. \tag{3}$$

In particular, if H_t is reversible with respect to U_t for almost all t (concerning ℓ), then H is reversible with respect to π.

Equation (3) describes the detailed balance condition of H_t with respect to U_t in average sense, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_\ell[H_\cdot(x, \mathrm{d}y) U_\cdot(\mathrm{d}x)] = \mathbb{E}_\ell[H_\cdot(y, \mathrm{d}x) U_\cdot(\mathrm{d}y)], \quad x, y \in K.$$

Now we prove Lemma 1.

Proof. First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_K \varrho(x)\, \mathrm{d}x &= \int_0^\infty \int_K \mathbf{1}_{[0, \varrho(x)]}(s)\, \mathrm{d}x\, \mathrm{d}s \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_K \mathbf{1}_{K(s)}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x\, \mathrm{d}s = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))\, \mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

By this, we obtain for any $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ that

$$\int_B H(x, A)\, \pi(\mathrm{d}x) = \int_0^\infty \int_B H_t(x, A)\, U_t(\mathrm{d}x)\, \ell(t)\mathrm{d}t.$$

As an immediate consequence from the previous equation we have the claimed equivalence of reversibility and (3). By the definition of the reversibility of H_t according to U_t holds

$$\int_B H_t(x, A)\, U_t(\mathrm{d}x) = \int_A H_t(x, B)\, U_t(\mathrm{d}x).$$

This, combined with (3), leads to the reversibility of H. □

We always want to have that H is reversible with respect to π. Therefore we formulate the following assumption.

Assumption 1. *Let H_t be reversible with respect to U_t for any $t \in [0, \infty)$.*

Now we define Hilbert spaces of square integrable functions and Markov operators. Let $t \geq 0$ and $L_{2,t} = L_2(K(t), U_t)$ be the space of functions $f\colon K(t) \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\|f\|_{2,t}^2 = \int_{K(t)} |f(x)|^2 \, U_t(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty.$$

The Markov operator $H_t\colon L_{2,t} \to L_{2,t}$ is given by

$$H_t f(x) = \int_{K(t)} f(y) \, H_t(x, \mathrm{d}y). \tag{4}$$

Further let $L_{2,\pi} = L_2(K, \pi)$ be the space of functions $f\colon K \to \mathbb{R}$ which satisfy

$$\|f\|_{2,\pi} = \int_K |f(x)|^2 \, \pi(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty.$$

The Markov operator $H\colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\pi}$ is defined by

$$Hf(x) = \frac{1}{\varrho(x)} \int_0^{\varrho(x)} H_t f(x) \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

and similarly $U\colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\pi}$ by

$$Uf(x) = \frac{1}{\varrho(x)} \int_0^{\varrho(x)} U_t(f) \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

where $U_t(f) = \int_{K(t)} f(x) \, U_t(\mathrm{d}x)$ is a special case of (4). Obviously, $U\mathbf{1}_A(x) = U(x, A)$ for any $x \in K$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(K)$. We consider the functional

$$S(f) = \int_K f(x) \, \pi(\mathrm{d}x), \quad f \in L_{2,\pi}$$

as operator $S\colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\pi}$ which maps functions to constant functions, given by their mean value. We say $f \in L_{2,\pi}^0$ iff $f \in L_{2,\pi}$ and $S(f) = 0$. Now the (absolute) spectral gap of a Markov kernel or Markov operator $P\colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\pi}$ is given by

$$\operatorname{gap}(P) = 1 - \|P - S\|_{L_2 \to L_2} = 1 - \|P\|_{L_{2,\pi}^0 \to L_{2,\pi}^0}.$$

For details of the last equality we refer to [Rud12, Lemma 3.16]. In the following we provide a relation between the norms of the different Hilbert spaces.

Lemma 2. *With the notation from above we obtain*

$$S(f) = \int_0^\infty U_t(f)\ \ell(t)\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{5}$$

In particular,

$$\|f\|_{2,\pi}^2 = \int_0^\infty \|f\|_{2,t}^2\ \ell(t)\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{6}$$

Proof. The assertion of (6) is a special case of (5), since $S(|f|^2) = \|f\|_{2,\pi}^2$. By $\int_K \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))\,\mathrm{d}s$, see in the proof of Lemma 1, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} S(f) &= \frac{\int_K f(x)\,\varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x}{\int_0^\infty \mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))\,\mathrm{d}s} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{K(t)} f(x)\,\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}\,\ell(t)\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^\infty U_t(f)\,\ell(t)\,\mathrm{d}t, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (5). □

2.1. **A useful representation.** We define a $d+1$-dimensional auxiliary state space. Let

$$K_\varrho = \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid x \in K,\ t \in [0, \varrho(x)]\}$$

and let μ be the uniform distribution on $(K_\varrho, \mathcal{B}(K_\varrho))$, i.e.

$$\mu(\mathrm{d}(x,t)) = \frac{\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{vol}_{d+1}(K_\varrho)}.$$

Note that $\mathrm{vol}_{d+1}(K_\varrho) = \int_K \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$. The space of functions $f\colon K_\varrho \to \mathbb{R}$ which satisfy

$$\|f\|_{2,\mu}^2 = \int_{K_\varrho} |f(x,s)|^2\,\mu(\mathrm{d}(x,s)) < \infty$$

is denoted by $L_{2,\mu} = L_2(K_\varrho, \mu)$. Let $T\colon L_{2,\mu} \to L_{2,\pi}$ and $T^*\colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\mu}$ be given by

$$Tf(x) = \frac{1}{\varrho(x)} \int_0^{\varrho(x)} f(x,s)\,\mathrm{d}s, \quad \text{and} \quad T^*f(x,s) = f(x).$$

Then T^* is the adjoint operator of T, i.e. for the corresponding inner-products we have for all $f \in L_{2,\pi}$ and $g \in L_{2,\mu}$ that

$$\langle f, Tg\rangle_\pi = \langle T^*f, g\rangle_\mu.$$

Then, let $\widetilde{H}\colon L_{2,\mu} \to L_{2,\mu}$ and $\widetilde{U}\colon L_{2,\mu} \to L_{2,\mu}$ be given by

$$\widetilde{H}f(x,s) = \int_{K(s)} f(y,s)\,H_s(x,\mathrm{d}y)$$

and

$$\widetilde{U}f(x,s) = \int_{K(s)} f(y,s)\, U_s(\mathrm{d}y).$$

Note that

$$\left\|\widetilde{H}\right\|_{L_{2,\mu}\to L_{2,\mu}} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\|\widetilde{U}\right\|_{L_{2,\mu}\to L_{2,\mu}} = 1.$$

By the construction we have the following.

Lemma 3. *Let H, U, T, T^*, $\widetilde{H}$ and $\widetilde{U}$ as above. Then*

$$H = T\widetilde{H}T^* \quad \textit{and} \quad U = T\widetilde{U}T^*.$$

Note that $TT^*\colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\pi}$ satisfies $TT^*f(x) = f(x)$, i.e. TT^* is the identity operator, and $T^*T\colon L_{2,\mu} \to L_{2,\mu}$ satisfies

$$T^*Tf(x,s) = Tf(x),$$

i.e. it returns the average of the function $f(x,\cdot)$ over all slices.

3. On the spectral gap of hybrid slice samplers

We start with a relation between the convergence on the slices and the convergence of $T\widetilde{H}^kT^*$ to $T\widetilde{U}T^*$ for increasing k.

Lemma 4. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\left\|T(\widetilde{H}^k - \widetilde{U})T^*\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \le \sup_{x\in K}\left(\int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\|H_t^k - U_t\right\|^2_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}} \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. First, note that $\|f\|_{2,\pi} < \infty$ implies $\|f\|_{2,t} < \infty$ for ℓ-a.e. t. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in L_{2,\pi}$ we have

$$(\widetilde{H}^kT^*f)(x,t) = (H_t^kf)(x) \quad \text{and} \quad (\widetilde{U}T^*f)(x,t) = U_t(f),$$

such that

$$T(\widetilde{H}^k - \widetilde{U})T^*f(x) = \int_0^\infty (H_t^k - U_t)f(x)\,\frac{\mathbf{1}_{K(t)}(x)}{\varrho(x)}\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|T(\widetilde{H}^k - \widetilde{U})T^*f\right\|^2_{2,\pi} = \int_K \left|\int_0^\infty (H_t^k - U_t)f(x)\,\frac{\mathbf{1}_{K(t)}(x)}{\varrho(x)}\,\mathrm{d}t\right|^2 \pi(\mathrm{d}x)\\
&\le \int_K \int_0^\infty \left|(H_t^k - U_t)f(x)\right|^2 \frac{\mathbf{1}_{K(t)}(t)}{\varrho(x)}\,\mathrm{d}t\,\frac{\varrho(x)}{\int_K \varrho(y)\,\mathrm{d}y}\,\mathrm{d}x\\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_{K(t)} \left|(H_t^k - U_t)f(x)\right|^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}\,\frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\int_0^\infty \mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))\,\mathrm{d}s}\,\mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^\infty \left\|(H_t^k - U_t)f\right\|_{2,t}^2 \, \ell(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \left\|H_t^k - U_t\right\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}^2 \|f\|_{2,t}^2 \, \ell(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_{K(t)} \left\|H_t^k - U_t\right\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}^2 |f(x)|^2 \, \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))} \, \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\int_0^\infty \mathrm{vol}_d(K(s))\,\mathrm{d}s}\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&= \int_K \int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\|H_t^k - U_t\right\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)} \, |f(x)|^2 \, \frac{\varrho(x)}{\int_K \varrho(y)\,\mathrm{d}y}\mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq \|f\|_{2,\pi}^2 \, \sup_{x\in K} \int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\|H_t^k - U_t\right\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Remark 5. If there exists a number $\beta \in [0,1]$ such that $\|H_t - U_t\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}} \leq \beta$ for any $t \geq 0$, then one obtains by (6) that

$$\left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \beta^k.$$

Now a corollary follows which provides a lower bound for $\mathrm{gap}(T\widetilde{H}^k T^*)$.

Corollary 6. *Let us assume that* $\mathrm{gap}(U) > 0$, *i.e.* $\|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} < 1$, *and let us denote*

$$\beta_k = \sup_{x\in K} \left(\int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\|H_t^k - U_t\right\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Then

$$\mathrm{gap}(T\widetilde{H}^k T^*) \geq \mathrm{gap}(U) - \beta_k. \tag{7}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove

$$\left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} + \beta_k.$$

By $\widetilde{H}^k = \widetilde{U} + \widetilde{H}^k - \widetilde{U}$ and Lemma 4 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} &= \left\|T\widetilde{U}T^* - S + T(\widetilde{H}^k - \widetilde{U})T^*\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \\
&\leq \|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} + \beta_k.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Remark 7. If one can sample with respect to U_t for every $t \geq 0$, then $H_t = U_t$ and in the estimate of Corollary 6 we obtain $\beta_k = 0$ and equality in (7).

Now let us state the main theorem.

Theorem 8. *Let us assume that for almost all t (with respect to ℓ) H_t is positive semi-definite on $L_{2,t}$ and let*

$$\beta_k = \sup_{x\in K} \left(\int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\| H_t^k - U_t \right\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}}^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Further assume that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$. Then

$$\frac{\mathrm{gap}(U) - \beta_k}{k} \leq \mathrm{gap}(H) \leq \mathrm{gap}(U), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{8}$$

Several conclusions can be drawn from the theorem: First, under the assumption that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$, the LHS of (8) implies that in the setting of the theorem, whenever the simple slice sampler has a spectral gap, so does the hybrid version. See Section 4 for examples. Second, it also provides a quantitative bound on $\mathrm{gap}(H)$ given appropriate estimates on $\mathrm{gap}(U)$ and β_k. Third, the RHS of (8) verifies the intuitive result that the simple slice sampler is better than the hybrid one (in terms of the spectral gap).

To prove the theorem we need some further results.

Lemma 9. *(1) Let H_t be reversible with respect to U_t for any t. Then $\widetilde{H}$ is self-adjoint on $L_{2,\mu}$.*

(2) Assume that for almost all t (with respect to ℓ) H_t is positive semi-definite on $L_{2,t}$, i.e. for all $f \in L_{2,t}$ holds $\langle H_t f, f\rangle_t \geq 0$, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_t$ denotes the inner-product in $L_{2,t}$. Then $\widetilde{H}$ is positive semi-definite on $L_{2,\mu}$.

Proof. Note that $\|f\|_{2,\mu} < \infty$ implies $\|f(\cdot,t)\|_{2,t} < \infty$ for almost all t (with respect to ℓ).

To (1): Let $f, g \in L_{2,\mu}$ then we have to show that

$$\langle \widetilde{H} f, g\rangle_\mu = \langle f, \widetilde{H} g\rangle_\mu.$$

Note that for $f, g \in L_{2,\mu}$ we have for almost all t that

$$\langle H_t f(\cdot,t), g(\cdot,t)\rangle_t = \langle f(\cdot,t), H_t g(\cdot,t)\rangle_t.$$

By

$$\langle \widetilde{H} f, g\rangle_\mu = \int_{K_\varrho} \widetilde{H} f(x,t) g(x,t)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}(x,t))$$

$$= \int_K \int_0^{\varrho(x)} \int_{K(t)} f(y,t)\, H_t(x,\mathrm{d}y) g(x,t) \frac{\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{vol}_{d+1}(K_\varrho)}$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \int_{K(t)} \int_{K(t)} f(y,t)\, H_t(x, \mathrm{d}y) g(x,t)\, U_t(\mathrm{d}y)\, \ell(t)\, \mathrm{d}t$$
$$= \int_0^\infty \langle H_t f(\cdot,t), g(\cdot,t)\rangle_t\, \ell(t)\, \mathrm{d}t$$

the assertion of (1) is proven.

To (2): We have to prove for all $f \in L_{2,\mu}$ that

$$\langle \widetilde{H} f, f\rangle_\mu = \int_{K_\varrho} \widetilde{H} f(x,t) f(x,t)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}(x,t)) \geq 0.$$

Note that for $f \in L_{2,\mu}$ we have for almost all t that

$$\langle H_t f(\cdot,t), f(\cdot,t)\rangle_t \geq 0.$$

By the same computation as in (1) we obtain that the positive semi-definiteness of H_t carries over to $\widetilde{H}$.

□

In the following we will use some lemmas which are stated in Appendix A. The results are very similar to [Ull14, Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.6 and Corollary 4.7], see also [Ull12].

Lemma 10. *Let $\widetilde{H}$ be positive semi-definite on $L_{2,\mu}$. Then*

$$\left\| T\widetilde{H}^{k+1}T^* - S \right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \left\| T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S \right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{9}$$

Further, if

$$\beta_k = \sup_{x\in K} \left(\int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\| H_t^k - U_t \right\|^2_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}} \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)} \right)^{1/2}$$

and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$. *Then*

$$\|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \|H - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}.$$

Proof. Let $S_1 \colon L_{2,\mu} \to L_{2,\pi}$ and the adjoint $S_1^* \colon L_{2,\pi} \to L_{2,\mu}$ be given by

$$S_1(f) = \int_{K_\varrho} f(x,s)\, \mu(\mathrm{d}(x,s)) \quad \text{and} \quad S_1^*(f) = \int_K f(x)\, \pi(\mathrm{d}x).$$

Thus, $\langle S_1 f, g\rangle_\pi = \langle f, S_1^* g\rangle_\mu$. Furthermore observe that $S_1 S_1^* = S$. Let $R = T - S_1$ and note that $RR^* = I - S$, with identity I, and $RR^* = (RR^*)^2$. Since $RR^* \neq 0$ and the projection property $RR^* = (RR^*)^2$ one gets $\|RR^*\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} = 1$. We have

$$R\widetilde{H}^k R^* = (T - S_1)\widetilde{H}^k (T^* - S_1^*)$$
$$= T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - T\widetilde{H}^k S_1^* - S_1 \widetilde{H}^k T^* + S_1 \widetilde{H}^k S_1^* = T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S.$$

Further $\left\|S_1 \widetilde{H} S_1^*\right\|_{L_{2,\mu}\to L_{2,\mu}} \leq 1$. Then, by Lemma 20 it follows that

$$\left\|R\widetilde{H}^{k+1}R^*\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \left\|R\widetilde{H}^{k}R^*\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}$$

and the proof of (9) is completed.
By Lemma 4 we obtain $\left\|T(\widetilde{H}^k - \widetilde{U})T^*\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \beta_k$ and by (9) we obtain

$$\left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \|H - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies by triangle inequality that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} = \|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}$$

and the assertion is proven. □

Lemma 11. *Let $\widetilde{H}$ be positive semi-definite on $L_{2,\mu}$. Then*

$$\|H - S\|^k_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}, \tag{10}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 10 we use $R\widetilde{H}^k R^* = T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S$ to reformulate the assertion. It remains to prove that

$$\left\|R\widetilde{H}R^*\right\|^k_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \left\|R\widetilde{H}^k R^*\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}.$$

Recall that RR^* is a projection and satisfies $\|RR^*\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} = 1$. By Lemma 21 the assertion is proven. □

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. By Lemma 9 we know that $\widetilde{H}\colon L_{2,\mu} \to L_{2,\mu}$ is self-adjoint and positive semi-definite. By Lemma 10 we have

$$\|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \|H - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}.$$

By Theorem 6 we have for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} \leq \|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} + \beta_k. \tag{11}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|U - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} &\underset{(11)}{\geq} \left\|T\widetilde{H}^k T^* - S\right\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} - \beta_k \\ &\underset{(10)}{\geq} \|H - S\|^k_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}} - \beta_k\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\geq 1 - k\,(1 - \|H - S\|_{L_{2,\pi}\to L_{2,\pi}}) - \beta_k\\ &= 1 - k\,\mathrm{gap}(H) - \beta_k,\end{aligned}$$

where we applied a version of Bernoulli's inequality, i.e. $1 - x^n \leq n(1-x)$ for $x \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$\frac{\mathrm{gap}(U) - \beta_k}{k} \leq \mathrm{gap}(H)$$

and the proof is completed. □

4. Applications

In this section we apply Theorem 8 under different assumptions with different Markov chains on the slices. We provide a criterion of geometric ergodicity of these hybrid slice samplers by showing that there is a spectral gap whenever the simple slice sampler has a spectral gap.

First we consider a class of bimodal densities in a 1-dimensional setting. We study a stepping-out shrinkage slice sampler, suggested in [Nea03], which is explained in Figure 1.

Then we consider a hybrid slice sampler which performs a hit-and-run step on the slices in a d-dimensional setting. Here we impose very weak assumptions on the unnormalised densities. The drawback is that an implementation of this algorithm might be difficult.

Motivated by this difficulty we study a combination of the previous sampling procedures on the slices. This new hit-and-run, stepping-out, shrinkage slice sampler is presented in Figure 2. Here we consider a class of bimodal densities in a d-dimensional setting.

4.1. Stepping-out and shrinkage procedure.

We assume that we have a parameter $w > 0$ and an unnormalised density $\varrho\colon \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$. We say $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_w$ if the following conditions are satisfied: There exist $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ with $t_1 \leq t_2$ such that

(a) for all $t \in [0,t_1] \cup (t_2, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ the level set $K(t)$ is an interval;
(b) for all $t \in (t_1, t_2]$ there are disjoint intervals $K_1(t), K_2(t)$ such that

$$K(t) = K_1(t) \cup K_2(t)$$

and for all $\varepsilon > 0$ holds $K_i(t+\varepsilon) \subseteq K_i(t)$ for $i = 1, 2$;
(c) for all $t \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ we assume $\delta_t < w$ where

$$\delta_t := \begin{cases} \inf_{r\in K_1(t),\, s\in K_2(t)} |r-s| & t \in (t_1, t_2]\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

The next result shows that certain bimodal densities belong to $\mathcal{R}_w$.

Lemma 12. *Let $\varrho_1 \colon \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ and $\varrho_2 \colon \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty)$ be unnormalised density functions. Let us assume that ϱ_1 and ϱ_2 are quasi-concave, i.e. the level sets are intervals and*

$$\inf_{r \in \arg\max \varrho_1,\, s \in \arg\max \varrho_2} |r-s| < w.$$

Then $\varrho_{\max} := \max\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2\} \in \mathcal{R}_w$.

Proof. For $t \in [0, \|\varrho_{\max}\|_\infty]$ let $K_{\varrho_{\max}}(t)$, $K_{\varrho_1}(t)$ and $K_{\varrho_2}(t)$ be the level sets of $\varrho_{\max}$, ϱ_1 and ϱ_2 of level t. Note that

$$K_{\varrho_{\max}}(t) = K_{\varrho_1}(t) \cup K_{\varrho_2}(t).$$

With the choice

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &= \inf\{t \in [0, \|\varrho_{\max}\|_\infty] \mid K_{\varrho_1}(t) \cap K_{\varrho_2}(t) = \emptyset\}, \\ t_2 &= \min\{\|\varrho_1\|_\infty, \|\varrho_2\|_\infty\} \end{aligned}$$

we have (a) and (b). For $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $K_{\varrho_i}(t+\varepsilon) \subseteq K_{\varrho_i}(t)$ and $\arg\max \varrho_i = K_{\varrho_i}(\|\varrho_i\|_\infty)$ with $i = 1, 2$ so that

$$\inf_{r \in K_{\varrho_1}(t),\, s \in K_{\varrho_2}(t)} |r-s| \le \inf_{r \in \arg\max \varrho_1,\, s \in \arg\max \varrho_2} |r-s| < w.$$

□

In [Nea03] a stepping-out and shrinkage procedure is suggested for the transitions on the level sets. The procedures are explained in Figure 1 where a single transition from the resulting hybrid slice sampler from x to y is presented.

For short we write $|K(t)| = \mathrm{vol}_1(K(t))$. The transiton kernel H_t on $K(t)$ for $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ of the stepping-out and shrinkage slice sampler is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(x, A) &= \frac{(w-\delta_t)}{w} \frac{|K(t)|}{(|K(t)|+\delta_t)}\, U_t(A) \\ &\quad + [1 - \frac{(w-\delta_t)}{w} \frac{|K(t)|}{(|K(t)|+\delta_t)}] \left[\mathbf{1}_{K_1(t)}(x) U_{t,1}(A) + \mathbf{1}_{K_2(t)}(x) U_{t,2}(A)\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $U_{t,i}$ denotes the uniform distribution in $K_i(t)$, i.e.

$$U_{t,i}(A) = \frac{|K_i(t) \cap A|}{|K_i(t)|}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Note that for $t \in [0, t_1] \cup (t_2, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ we have $H_t = U_t$ since $\delta_t = 0$. It is easy to see that

$$\|H_t - U_t\|_{L_{t,2}} = 1 - \frac{(w-\delta_t)}{w} \frac{|K(t)|}{(|K(t)|+\delta_t)}.$$

(1) Choose a level $t \sim \mathcal{U}[0, \varrho(x)]$;
(2) Stepping-out with input x, t, w outputs an interval $[L, R]$:
  (a) Choose $u \sim \mathcal{U}[0,1]$. Set $L = x - uw$ and $R = L + w$;
  (b) Repeat until $t > \varrho(L)$, i.e. $L \notin K(t)$: Set $L = L - w$;
  (c) Repeat until $t > \varrho(R)$, i.e. $R \notin K(t)$: Set $R = R + w$;
(3) Shrinkage procedure with input $[L, R]$ outputs y:
  (a) Set $\bar{L} = L$ and $\bar{R} = R$;
  (b) Repeat:
    (i) Choose $v \sim \mathcal{U}[0,1]$ and set $y = \bar{L} + v(\bar{R} - \bar{L})$;
    (ii) If $y \in K(t)$ then return y and exit the loop;
    (iii) If $y < x$ then set $\bar{L} = y$, else $\bar{R} = y$.

FIGURE 1. A hybrid slice sampling transition of the stepping-out and shrinkage procedure from x to y, i.e. input x and output y. Stepping-out procedure has input x (current state), t (chosen level), $w > 0$ (step size parameter from $\mathcal{R}_w$) and outputs an interval $[L, R]$. Shrinkage procedure has input $[L, R]$ and output y.

Now we provide two useful results to apply Theorem 8.

Lemma 13. *Let $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_w$ with $t_2 \geq 0$ satisfying (a) and (b).*

(1) For any $t \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ the transition kernel H_t induces a positive semi-definite operator, i.e. for $f \in L_{2,t}$ holds $\langle H_t f, f\rangle_t \geq 0$.
(2) Then

$$\beta_k = \left(\frac{1}{t_2} \int_0^{t_2} \left[1 - \frac{(w - \delta_t)}{w} \frac{|K(t)|}{(|K(t)| + \delta_t)} \right]^{2k} \mathrm{d}t \right)^{1/2}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Let

$$\gamma_t = \frac{(w - \delta_t)}{w} \frac{|K(t)|}{(|K(t)| + \delta_t)}.$$

To (1): The assertion is proven by

$$\langle H_t f, f\rangle_t = \gamma_t \, U_t(f)^2 + (1 - \gamma_t) \left[\frac{|K_1(t)|}{|K(t)|} \, U_{t,1}(f)^2 + \frac{|K_2(t)|}{|K(t)|} \, U_{t,2}(f)^2 \right],$$

where $U_{t,i}(f)$ denotes the expectation of f with respect to $U_{t,i}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

To (2): For $t \in [0, t_2]$ the function $1 - \gamma_t$ is increasing and for $t \in (t_2, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ we have $1 - \gamma_t = 0$. Further, note that for $a \in (0, \infty)$,

any increasing function $g\colon [0,a] \to \mathbb{R}$ and $p, q \in [0,a]$ with $p \leq q$ holds

$$\frac{1}{p}\int_0^p g(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \leq \frac{1}{q}\int_0^q g(t)\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

This applied in our setting proves the assertion.

□

By Theorem 8 and the previous lemma we have the following result.

Corollary 14. *For any $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_w$ the stepping-out and shrinkage slice sampler has a spectral gap if and only if the simple slice sampler has a spectral gap.*

4.2. **Hit-and-run slice sampler.** The idea is to combine the hit-and-run algorithm with slice sampling. We ask whether a spectral gap of simple slice sampling implies a spectral gap of this combination. The hit-and-run algorithm was proposed by Smith [Smi84]. It is well studied, see for example [BRS93, KS98, DF97, Lov99, LV06, KSZ11, RU13], and used for numerical integration, see [Rud12, Rud13]. We define the setting and the transition kernel of the hit-and-run.

We consider a d-dimensional state space $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varrho\colon K \to [0,\infty)$ is an unnormalised density. We denote the diameter of a level set by

$$\operatorname{diam}(K(t)) = \sup_{x,y\in K(t)} |x-y|$$

with the Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$. We assume that there exists a number $c \in (0,1]$ such that

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_d(K(t))}{\operatorname{diam}(K(t))^d} = c > 0. \tag{12}$$

If K is bounded and has positive Lebesgue measure then condition (12) holds. For example, the density of a standard normal distribution satisfies (12) with unbounded K. Note that (12) is a very weak assumption on ϱ since there is no regularity condition on the level sets and also no condition on the modality.

Let S_{d-1} be the Euclidean unit sphere and $\sigma_d = \operatorname{vol}_{d-1}(S_{d-1})$. A transition from x to y by hit-and-run on the level set $K(t)$ works as follows:

(1) Choose $\theta \in S_{d-1}$ uniformly distributed;
(2) Choose y according to the uniform distribution on the line $x+r\theta$ intersected with $K(t)$.

This leads to

$$H_t(x,A) = \int_{S_{d-1}} \int_{L_t(x,\theta)} \mathbf{1}_A(x+s\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{\mathrm{vol}_1(L_t(x,\theta))} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d}$$

with

$$L_t(x,\theta) = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid x + r\theta \in K(t)\}.$$

The hit-and-run algorithm induces a positive-semidefinite operator on $L_{2,t}$, see [RU13], and the following is well known, see for example [DF97].

Proposition 15. *For $t \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$, $x \in K(t)$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(K)$ we have*

$$H_t(x,A) = \frac{2}{\sigma_d} \int_A \frac{\mathrm{d}y}{|x-y|^{d-1} \, \mathrm{vol}_1(L(x, \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}))} \tag{13}$$

and

$$\|H_t - U_t\|_{L_{2,t} \to L_{2,t}} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{\sigma_d} \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d}. \tag{14}$$

Proof. The representation of H_t stated in (13) is well known, see for example [DF97]. From this we have for any $x \in K(t)$ that

$$H_t(x,A) \geq \frac{2}{\sigma_d} \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t) \cap A)}{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}.$$

which means that the whole state space $K(t)$ is a small set. By [MT09] we have uniform ergodicity and by [Rud12, Proposition 3.24] we obtain (14). □

Further, we obtain the following helpful result.

Lemma 16. *Under the assumptions of this section we have with*

$$\beta_k = \sup_{x \in K} \left(\int_0^{\varrho(x)} \left\| H_t^k - U_t \right\|_{L_{2,t} \to L_{2,t}}^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}t}{\varrho(x)} \right)^{1/2}$$

that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$.

Proof. By (14) and the reversibility of H_t holds

$$\left\| H_t^k - U_t \right\|_{L_{2,t} \to L_{2,t}}^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sigma_d} \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d} \right)^{2k}. \tag{15}$$

We define the continuous extension

$$g_k(t) = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sigma_d} \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d} \right)^{2k} & t > 0 \\ \left(1 - \frac{2c}{\sigma_d} \right)^{2k} & t = 0. \end{cases}$$

of the upper bound of (15) with $c \in (0,1]$ from (12) and obtain $\beta_k \leq \sup_{r\in(0,\|\varrho\|_\infty]} \left(\frac{1}{r}\int_0^r g_k(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right)^{1/2}$. By the continuous extension

$$h_k(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{r}\int_0^r g_k(t)\mathrm{d}t & r > 0 \\ g_k(0) & r = 0. \end{cases}$$

the supremum can be replaced by a maximum over $r \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ which is attained, say for $r_0 \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$, since h_k is continuous. Thus

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{r_0}\int_0^{r_0} g_k(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{r_0}\int_0^{r_0} \lim_{k\to\infty} g_k(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = 0.$$

□

This observation leads by Theorem 8 to the following result.

Corollary 17. *Let $\varrho\colon K \to [0,\infty)$ and assume there exists a number $c \in (0,1]$ such that*

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d} = c.$$

Then the hit-and-run slice sampler has an absolute spectral gap if and only if the simple slice sampler has an absolute spectral gap.

We stress that the assumptions on ϱ are very weak. We do not know whether the level sets are convex, star-shaped or have any additional structure. This also means that it might be difficult to implement the hit-and-run in this generality. In the next subsection we consider a combination of hit-and-run, stepping-out and shrinkage procedure, where we provide a concrete implementable algorithm.

4.3. **Hit-and-run, stepping-out and shrinkage slice sampler.** We combine hit-and-run, stepping-out and shrinkage procedure. Let $w > 0$, let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and assume that $\varrho\colon K \to [0,\infty)$. We say $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_{d,w}$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

(a) there are unnormalised quasi-concave densities $\varrho_1, \varrho_2\colon K \to [0,\infty)$, i.e. the level sets are convex, with

$$\inf_{y\in\arg\max\varrho_1,\, z\in\arg\max\varrho_2} |z-y| \leq \frac{w}{2}$$

such that $\varrho(x) = \max\{\varrho_1(x), \varrho_2(x)\}$.

(b) there exists a number $c \in (0,1]$ such that

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d} = c.$$

For $i = 1, 2$ let the level set of ϱ_i be denoted by $K_i(t)$ with $t \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$. Then by $\varrho = \max\{\varrho_1, \varrho_2\}$ follows that $K(t) = K_1(t) \cup K_2(t)$. If K is bounded and has positive Lebesgue measure, then (b) is always satisfied. For $K = \mathbb{R}^d$ one has to check (b). For example $\varrho\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, \infty)$ with

$$\varrho(x) = \max\{\exp(-\alpha\,|x|^2), \exp(-\beta\,|x - x_0|^2)\}$$

and $2\beta \leq \alpha$ satifies (a) and (b) for $w = 2\,|x_0|$.

The rough idea for a transition from x to y of the combination of the different methods on the level set $K(t)$ is as follows: Determine a line/segment of the form

$$L_t(x, \theta) = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid x + r\theta \in K(t)\}.$$

Then, run the stepping out and shrinkage procedure on $L_t(x, \theta)$ and return y. In detail, we present a single transition from x to y of the hit-and-run, stepping-out, shrinkage slice sampler in Figure 2.

(1) Choose a level $t \sim \mathcal{U}[0, \varrho(x)]$;
(2) Choose a direction $\theta \in S_{d-1}$ uniformly distributed;
(3) Stepping-out on $L_t(x, \theta)$ with $w > 0$ outputs an interval $[L, R]$:
  (a) Choose $u \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$. Set $L = uw$ and $R = L + w$;
  (b) Repeat until $t > \varrho(x + L\theta)$, i.e. $L \notin L_t(x, \theta)$:
    Set $L = L - w$;
  (c) Repeat until $t > \varrho(x + R\theta)$, i.e. $R \notin L_t(x, \theta)$:
    Set $R = R + w$;
(4) Shrinkage procedure with input $[L, R]$ outputs y:
  (a) Set $\bar{L} = L$ and $\bar{R} = R$;
  (b) Repeat:
    (i) Choose $v \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$ and set $s = \bar{L} + v(\bar{R} - \bar{L})$;
    (ii) If $s \in L_t(x, \theta)$ return $y = x + s\theta$ and exit the loop;
    (iii) If $s < 0$ then set $\bar{L} = s$, else $\bar{R} = s$.

FIGURE 2. A hybrid slice sampling transition of hit-and-run, stepping-out and shrinkage procedure from x to y, i.e. input x and output y. Stepping-out procedure has input $L_t(x, \theta)$ (line of hit-and-run on level set), $w > 0$ (step size parameter from $\mathcal{R}_{d,w}$) and outputs an interval $[L, R]$. Shrinkage procedure has input $[L, R]$ and output $y = x + s\theta$.

Now we present the corresponding transition kernel on $K(t)$. Since $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_{d,w}$ we can define for $i = 1, 2$,

$$L_{t,i}(x, \theta) = \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid x + s\theta \in K_i(t)\}$$

and have $L_t(x,\theta) = L_{t,1}(x,\theta) \cup L_{t,2}(x,\theta)$. Let

$$\delta_{t,\theta,x} = \inf_{r\in L_{t,1}(x,\theta),\, s\in L_{t,2}(x,\theta)} |r-s|\,.$$

and note that if $\delta_{t,\theta,x} > 0$ then $L_{t,1}(x,\theta) \cap L_{t,2}(x,\theta) = \emptyset$.

We also write for short $|L_t(x,\theta)| = \mathrm{vol}_1(L_t(x,\theta))$ and for $A \subseteq K$, $x \in K$, $\theta \in S_{d-1}$ let $A_{x,\theta} = \{s \in \mathbb{R} \mid x + s\theta \in A\}$. With this notation the transition kernel H_t on $K(t)$ is given by

$$H_t(x,A) = \int_{S_{d-1}} \Bigg[\gamma_t(x,\theta)\frac{|L_t(x,\theta)\cap A_{x,\theta}|}{|L_t(x,\theta)|} + (1-\gamma_t(x,\theta))\sum_{i=1}^{2} \mathbf{1}_{K_i(t)}(x)\frac{|L_{t,i}(x,\theta)\cap A_{x,\theta}|}{|L_{t,i}(x,\theta)|}\Bigg]\frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d},$$

with

$$\gamma_t(x,\theta) = \frac{(w-\delta_{t,x,\theta})}{w}\cdot\frac{|L_t(x,\theta)|}{|L_t(x,\theta)|+\delta_{t,x,\theta}}.$$

The following result is helpful.

Lemma 18. *For $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_{d,w}$ and for any $t \in [0, \|\varrho\|_\infty]$ holds:*

1. *The transition kernel H_t induces a positive semi-definite operator on $L_{2,t}$, i.e. for $f \in L_{2,t}$ holds $\langle H_t f, f\rangle_t \geq 0$.*
2. *We have*

$$\|H_t - U_t\|_{L_{2,t}\to L_{2,t}} \leq 1 - \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\sigma_d\,\mathrm{diam}(K(t))^d}, \tag{16}$$

in particular $\lim_{k\to\infty}\beta_k = 0$ with β_k defined in Theorem 8.

Proof. First, note that $L_t(x+s\theta,\theta) = L_t(x,\theta) - s$, $|L_t(x+s\theta,\theta)| = |L_t(x,\theta)|$ and $\gamma_t(x+s\theta,\theta) = \gamma_t(x,\theta)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\theta \in S_{d-1}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

To (1): Let $C_t = \mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))$. We have

$$\langle f, H_t f\rangle_t = \int_{S_{d-1}}\int_{K(t)} \gamma_t(x,\theta)f(x)\int_{L_t(x,\theta)} f(x+r\theta)\,\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{|L_t(x,\theta)|}\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{C_t}\frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d}$$
$$+\sum_{i=1}^{2}\int_{S_{d-1}}\int_{K_i(t)} (1-\gamma_t(x,\theta))f(x)\int_{L_{t,i}(x,\theta)} f(x+r\theta)\,\frac{\mathrm{d}r}{|L_{t,i}(x,\theta)|}\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{C_t}\frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d}.$$

We prove positivity of the first summand. The positivity of the other two summands follows by the same line of arguments. For $\theta \in S_{d-1}$ let us define the projected set

$$P_{\theta^\perp}(K(t)) = \{\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \tilde{x}\perp\theta,\ \exists s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ s.t. } \tilde{x} + \theta s \in K(t)\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{S_{d-1}} \int_{K(t)} \gamma_t(x,\theta) f(x) \int_{L_t(x,\theta)} f(x+r\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}r}{|L_t(x,\theta)|} \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{C_t} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \\
&= \int_{S_{d-1}} \int_{P_{\theta^\perp}(K(t))} \int_{L_t(\tilde{x},\theta)} \gamma_t(\tilde{x}+s\theta,\theta) f(\tilde{x}+s\theta) \times \\
&\qquad \int_{L_t(\tilde{x}+s\theta,\theta)} f(\tilde{x}+(r+s)\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}r}{|L_t(\tilde{x}+s\theta,\theta)|} \frac{\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}}{C_t} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \\
&= \int_{S_{d-1}} \int_{P_{\theta^\perp}(K(t))} \int_{L_t(\tilde{x},\theta)} \gamma_t(\tilde{x},\theta) f(\tilde{x}+s\theta) \times \\
&\qquad \int_{L_t(\tilde{x},\theta)-s} f(\tilde{x}+(r+s)\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}r}{|L_t(\tilde{x},\theta)-s|} \frac{\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}}{C_t} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \\
&= \int_{S_{d-1}} \int_{P_{\theta^\perp}(K(t))} \frac{\gamma_t(\tilde{x},\theta)}{|L_t(\tilde{x},\theta)|} \left(\int_{L_t(\tilde{x},\theta)} f(\tilde{x}+u\theta)\mathrm{d}u \right)^2 \frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}}{C_t} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives that H_t is positive semi-definite.

To (2): For any $x \in K(t)$ and $A \subseteq K(t)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_t(x,A) &\geq \int_{S_{d-1}} \gamma_t(x,\theta) \int_{L_t(x,\theta)} \mathbf{1}_A(x+s\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{|L_t(x,\theta)|} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \\
&= \int_{S_{d-1}} \int_0^\infty \gamma_t(x,\theta) \mathbf{1}_A(x-s\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{|L_t(x,\theta)|} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \\
&\quad + \int_{S_{d-1}} \int_0^\infty \gamma_t(x,\theta) \mathbf{1}_A(x+s\theta) \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{|L_t(x,\theta)|} \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{\sigma_d} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\gamma_t(x, \frac{y}{|y|})}{\sigma_d \cdot \left| L_t(x, \frac{y}{|y|}) \right|} \frac{\mathbf{1}_A(x-y)}{|y|^{d-1}} \mathrm{d}y + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\gamma_t(x, \frac{y}{|y|})}{\sigma_d \cdot \left| L_t(x, \frac{y}{|y|}) \right|} \frac{\mathbf{1}_A(x+y)}{|y|^{d-1}} \mathrm{d}y \\
&= \frac{2}{\sigma_d} \int_A \frac{\gamma_t(x, \frac{x-y}{|x-y|})}{|x-y|^{d-1} \left| L_t(x, \frac{x-y}{|x-y|}) \right|} \mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}{\sigma_d \operatorname{diam}(K(t))^d} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{vol}_d(A)}{\mathrm{vol}_d(K(t))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality follows by the fact that $\delta_{t,x,\theta} \leq w/2$ and $|L_t(x,\theta)| + \delta_{t,x,\theta} \leq \operatorname{diam}(K(t))$. Thus, by [MT09] we have uniform ergodicity and by [Rud12, Proposition 3.24] we obtain (16). Finally, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = 0$ follows by the same arguments as Lemma 16.

□

This observation leads by Theorem 8 to the following result.

Corollary 19. *Let $\varrho \in \mathcal{R}_{d,w}$. Then, the hit-and-run, stepping-out, shrinkage slice sampler has an absolute spectral gap if and only if the simple slice sampler has an absolute spectral gap.*

5. Concluding remarks

We provide a general framework to prove convergence results of hybrid slice sampling via spectral gap arguments. More precisely, we state sufficient conditions for the spectral gap of appropriately designed hybrid slice sampler to be equivalent to the spectral gap of the simple slice sampler. Since all Markov chains we are considering are reversible, this also provides a criterion for geometric ergodicity, see [RR97]. Our Theorem 8 might also be used to derive explicit estimates of the spectral gap of hybrid slice samplers.

To illustrate how our analysis can be applied to specific hybrid slice sampling implementations, we analyse the hit-and-run on the slice algorithm on multidimensional targets under very weak conditions and the easily implementable stepping-out shrinkage hit-and-run on the slice for bimodal d-dimensional distributions. The latter analysis can be in principle extended to settings with more than two modes at the price of further notational and computational complexity.

These examples demonstrate that robustness of the simple slice sampler is inherited by its appropriately designed hybrid versions in realistic computational settings and give theoretical underpinning for their use in applications.

Appendix A. Technical lemmas

Lemma 20. *Let H_1 and H_2 be two Hilbert spaces. Further, let $R\colon H_2 \to H_1$ be a bounded linear operator with adjoint $R^*\colon H_1 \to H_2$ and let $Q\colon H_2 \to H_2$ be a bounded linear operator which is self-adjoint. Then*

$$\left\|RQ^{k+1}R^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1} \leq \|Q\|_{H_2\to H_2} \left\|R\,|Q|^k\,R^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1}.$$

Let us additionally assume that Q is positive semi-definite. Then

$$\left\|RQ^{k+1}R^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1} \leq \|Q\|_{H_2\to H_2} \left\|RQ^kR^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1}.$$

Proof. Let us denote the inner-products of H_1 by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_1$ and H_2 by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_2$. By the spectral theorem for the bounded and self-adjoint operator $Q\colon H_2 \to H_2$ we obtain

$$\frac{\langle QR^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2} = \int_{\mathrm{spec}(Q)} \lambda \,\mathrm{d}\nu_{Q,R^*f}(\lambda)$$

where $\operatorname{spec}(Q)$ denotes the spectrum of Q and ν_{Q,R^*f} denotes the normalized spectral measure. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|RQ^{k+1}R^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1} &= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \frac{\left|\langle Q^{k+1}R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2\right|}{\langle f,f\rangle_1} \\
&= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1} \frac{\left|\langle Q^{k+1}R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2\right|}{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2} \\
&= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1} \left|\int_{\operatorname{spec}(Q)} \lambda^{k+1}\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{Q,R^*f}(\lambda)\right| \\
&\leq \|Q\|_{H_2\to H_2} \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1} \int_{\operatorname{spec}(Q)} |\lambda|^k\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{Q,R^*f}(\lambda) \\
&= \|Q\|_{H_2\to H_2} \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1} \frac{\langle |Q|^k R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2} \\
&= \|Q\|_{H_2\to H_2} \left\|R\,|Q|^k\,R^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

We used that the operator norm of $Q\colon H_2 \to H_2$ and the operator norm of $|Q| : H_2 \to H_2$ is the same. If Q is positive semi-definite, then $Q = |Q|$. □

Lemma 21. *Let as assume that the conditions of Lemme 20 are satisfied. Further let* $\|R\|^2_{H_2\to H_1} = \|RR^*\|_{H_1\to H_1} \leq 1$. *Then*

$$\|RQR^*\|^k_{H_1\to H_1} \leq \left\|R\,|Q|^k\,R^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1}.$$

Let us additionally assume that Q is positive semi-definite. Then

$$\|RQR^*\|^k_{H_1\to H_1} \leq \left\|RQ^kR^*\right\|_{H_1\to H_1}.$$

Proof. We use the same notation as in the proof of Lemma 20. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|RQR^*\|^k_{H_1\to H_1} &= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \left(\frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1} \frac{|\langle QR^*f, R^*f\rangle_2|}{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}\right)^k \\
&= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \left(\frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1}\right)^k \left|\int_{\operatorname{spec}(Q)} \lambda\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{Q,R^*f}(\lambda)\right|^k \\
&\leq \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \left(\frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1}\right)^k \int_{\operatorname{spec}(Q)} |\lambda|^k\,\mathrm{d}\nu_{Q,R^*f}(\lambda) \\
&= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \left(\frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1}\right)^k \frac{\langle |Q|^k R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2} \\
&= \sup_{\langle f,f\rangle_1\neq 0} \left(\frac{\langle R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1}\right)^{k-1} \frac{\langle |Q|^k R^*f, R^*f\rangle_2}{\langle f,f\rangle_1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \|RR^*\|_{H_1\to H_1}^{k-1} \left\| R\,|Q|^k\,R^* \right\|_{H_1\to H_1} \leq \left\| R\,|Q|^k\,R^* \right\|_{H_1\to H_1}.$$

Note that we applied Jensen inequality. Further, if Q is positive-semidefinite then $Q = |Q|$, which finishes the proof. □

References

[Bax05] P. Baxendale, *Renewal theory and computable convergence rates for geometrically ergodic Markov chains*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **15** (2005), no. 1B, 700–738.

[BG93] J. Besag and P. Green, *Spatial statistics and Bayesian computation*, J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B (1993), 25–37.

[BŁ07] W. Bednorz and K. Łatuszyński, *A few remarks on Fixed-width output analysis for Markov chain Monte Carlo by Jones et al*, Journal of the American Statistical Association **102** (2007), no. 480, 1485–1486.

[BRS93] C. Bélisle, H. Romeijn, and R. Smith, *Hit-and-run algorithms for generating multivariate distributions*, Math. Oper. Res. **18** (1993), no. 2, 255–266.

[DF97] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, *On the Hit and Run Process*, Tech. rep. 497, Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley (1997), 1–16.

[ES88] R. Edwards and A. Sokal, *Generalization of the Fortuin-Kasteleyn-Swendsen-Wang representation and Monte Carlo algorithm*, Physical Review D **38** (1988), no. 6, 2009.

[FJ10] J. Flegal and G. Jones, *Batch means and spectral variance estimators in Markov chain Monte Carlo*, Ann. Statist. **38** (2010), no. 2, 1034–1070.

[Gey92] C. Geyer, *Practical Markov chain Monte Carlo*, Statist. Sci. **7** (1992), no. 4, 473–483.

[Hig98] D. Higdon, *Auxiliary Variable Methods for Markov Chain Monte Carlo with Applications*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **93** (1998), no. 442, 585–595.

[HJPR02] J. Hobert, G. Jones, B. Presnell, and J. Rosenthal, *On the applicability of regenerative simulation in Markov chain Monte Carlo*, Biometrika **89** (2002), no. 4, 731.

[JHCN06] G. Jones, M. Haran, B. Caffo, and R. Neath, *Fixed-width output analysis for Markov chain Monte Carlo*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **101** (2006), no. 476, 1537–1547.

[KM12] I. Kontoyiannis and S. Meyn, *Geometric ergodicity and the spectral gap of non-reversible Markov chains*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **154** (2012), no. 1-2, 327–339.

[KS86] C. Kipnis and Varadhan S, *Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusions*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **104** (1986), no. 1, 1–19.

[KS98] D. Kaufman and R. Smith, *Direction choice for accelerated convergence in hit-and-run sampling*, Oper. Res. **46** (1998), no. 1, 84–95.

[KSZ11] S. Kiatsupaibul, R. Smith, and Z. Zabinsky, *An Analysis of a Variation of Hit-and-run for Uniform Sampling from General Regions*, ACM Trans. Model. Comput. Simul. **21** (2011), no. 3, 16:1–16:11.

[Lov99] L. Lovász, *Hit-and-run mixes fast*, Math. Program. **86** (1999), no. 3, Ser. A, 443–461.

[ŁRT14] K. Łatuszyński, D. Rudolf, and A. Thiery, *Hit-and-run on the slice gets job done and is nice*, under preparation (2014).

[LV06] L. Lovász and S. Vempala, *Hit-and-run from a corner*, SIAM J. Comput. **35** (2006), no. 4, 985–1005.

[MAM10] I. Murray, R. Adams, and D. MacKay, *Elliptical slice sampling*, Journal of Machine Learning Research: W&CP **9** (2010), 541–548.

[MMR01] A. Mira, J. Møller, and G. Roberts, *Perfect slice samplers*, J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B **63** (2001), no. 3, 593–606.

[MT02] A. Mira and L. Tierney, *Efficiency and convergence properties of slice samplers*, Scand. J. Statist. **29** (2002), no. 1, 1–12.

[MT09] S. Meyn and R. Tweedie, *Markov chains and stochastic stability*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[Nea93] R. Neal, *Probabilistic inference using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods*, Tech. Rep. CRG-TR-93-1, Dept. Comp. Sci., U. of Toronto (1993).

[Nea03] ———, *Slice sampling*, Ann. Statist. **31** (2003), no. 3, 705–767, With discussions and a rejoinder by the author.

[NR14] E. Novak and D. Rudolf, *Computation of expectations by Markov chain Monte Carlo methods*, To appear in: Extraction of quantifiable information from complex systems, S. Dahlke et al. (eds.), Springer. (2014).

[RR97] G. Roberts and J. Rosenthal, *Geometric ergodicity and hybrid Markov chains*, Electron. Comm. Probab. **2** (1997), no. 2, 13–25.

[RR99] ———, *Convergence of slice sampler Markov chains*, J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol. **61** (1999), no. 3, 643–660.

[RR02] ———, *The polar slice sampler*, Stoch. Models **18** (2002), no. 2, 257–280.

[RR08] ———, *Variance bounding Markov chains*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **18** (2008), no. 3, 1201–1214.

[RU13] D. Rudolf and M. Ullrich, *Positivity of hit-and-run and related algorithms*, Electron. Commun. Probab. **18** (2013), 1–8.

[Rud91] W. Rudin, *Functional analysis*, second ed., International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics, McGraw-Hill Inc., New York, 1991.

[Rud12] D. Rudolf, *Explicit error bounds for Markov chain Monte Carlo*, Dissertationes Math. **485** (2012), 93 pp.

[Rud13] ———, *Hit-and-run for numerical integration*, J. Dick, F. Kuo, G. Peters, and I. Sloan (Eds.) - Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2012. Springer, Berlin (2013), 565–579.

[Smi84] R. Smith, *Efficient Monte Carlo procedures for generating points uniformly distributed over bounded regions*, Oper. Res. **32** (1984), no. 6, 1296–1308.

[Ull12] M. Ullrich, *Rapid mixing of Swendsen-Wang and single-bond dynamics in two dimensions*, ArXiv e-prints (2012).

[Ull14] ———, *Rapid mixing of Swendsen-Wang dynamics in two dimensions*, Dissertationes Math. **502** (2014).

[WS87] J. Wang and R. Swendsen, *Nonuniversal critical dynamics in Monte Carlo simulations*, Physical review letters (1987).

University Warwick

E-mail address: K.G.Latuszynski@warwick.ac.uk

Inst. für Math., Universität Jena, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany

E-mail address: daniel.rudolf@uni-jena.de